

Proposed Vocabulary Criteria			Vocabulary Assessment				
			meets criterion	partially meets criterion	does not meet criterion	criterion not applicable	criterion not assessed
Understandability, Reproducibility and Usability (URU) — Does the vocabulary conform to the highest degree practicable to the standards of good vocabulary practices laid out by the community?	purpose and scope	Is the purpose and scope of the vocabulary clearly stated in operational terms so that its fitness for particular purpose can be assessed and evaluated?					
	vocabulary content coverage	Does the vocabulary provide comprehensive or explicit in-depth coverage of the domain of interest it claims to address as stated in purpose and scope of the vocabulary segment?					
		Are there formal methods in place for expanding and refining the vocabulary?					
	concept orientation	Does each concept have a single, coherent meaning?	Does each term correspond to at least one meaning (nonvagueness)?				
			Does each concept correspond to no more than one meaning (nonambiguity)?				
			Does each meaning correspond to no more than one concept (nonredundancy)?				
		Does the vocabulary support synonyms and is synonymy explicitly represented?					
		Are relationships between concepts uniform across parallel domains within the vocabulary (internal consistency)?					
		Is the meaning of a concept, once created, inviolate?					
	concept permanence						
	nonsemantic concept identifiers	Does each concept have a unique identifier?					
		Are identifiers free of hierarchical or other implicit meaning?					
		Are identifiers not re-used when a concept is made absolute or is superseded?					
	polyhierarchy	Is the basic principle for any hierarchical arrangement explicitly stated?					
		Is any concept capable of having multiple semantic parents?					
		Does each concept have the same meaning regardless of the parent from which it is reached?					
	formal definitions	Does each term have a definitive set of relationships to other concepts that, taken together, are both individually necessary and collectively sufficient to distinguish the concept from all other concepts?					
		Does the vocabulary make explicit which concepts are atomic (i.e. non-composite)?					
		Does the vocabulary support the creation of composite concepts?					
		Are there formal definitions for non-atomic (i.e. composite) concepts?					
		Are there formal rules for inferring subsumption from the definitions?					
Is the logical definition of subsumption defined?							
explicitness of relations	Are the formal behavior of all links, relationships and attributes explicitly defined?						
rejection of NEC terms	Does the vocabulary reject the use of "not elsewhere classified" (NEC) terms?						
multiple granularities	If the vocabulary is intended to serve multiple purposes, does it provide different levels of granularity appropriate for the different purposes?						

	multiple consistent views	If the vocabulary is intended to serve multiple purposes, does it provide multiple views suitable for the different purposes? Does each concept have the same meaning regardless of the parent from which it is reached?							
	context representation	Does the vocabulary provide formal, explicit information about how concepts are used?							
	graceful evolution	Are there clear detailed descriptions of what changes occur and why?							
		Are "good" reasons for change enabled?: e.g. simple additions, refinement, pre-coordination, disambiguation, obsolescence, discovered redundancy, minor name changes							
		Are "bad" reasons for change avoided?: e.g. redundancy, name changes that alter the meaning of the concept, code reuse, code changes							
		Are updates and modifications referable to consistent version identifiers?							
	recognition of redundancy	Are there mechanisms provided by which redundancy can be recognized?							
		Are there mechanisms provided by which redundancy can be rendered transparent?							
Quality of Documentation — Is the vocabulary well described from a variety of viewpoints?	Is there a statement of the vocabulary's intended use, intended users and scope?								
	Is the list of concepts and definitions available?								
	Does available documentation describe:	vocabulary structure and organizing principles?							
		use of concept codes/identifiers?							
		use of semantic relationships?							
		output format(s)?							
		any restrictions on use?							
		any relationships/links to other resources?							
Are new versions accompanied by adequate documentation that describes how the new version differs from the one it replaces?									
Is there a description of methods or tools for acquisition and application of the vocabulary?									
Maintenance and Extensions (Change Management)	methods and philosophy	graceful evolution	(see individual criteria above)						
		concept permanence	Is there precise version control?						
			Are there mechanisms for permanent						
		recognition of redundancy	(see individual criteria above)						
			Are there mechanisms to handle change management (QA/QC), and what are they, for:	additions?					
			refinements?						
			precoordination?						
			disambiguation?						
obsolescence?									
discovered redundancy?									
minor name changes?									

	organization criteria	Consider the organization creating the vocabulary and its commitment to maintain it over time. Is maintenance of the vocabulary a core part of the organization's business?							
		If not, how long will the organization be actively participating?							
		If not, has the organization made creditable arrangements with another organization for maintenance and enhancement? What are they?							
	extensions to other terminologies	If the vocabulary extends or overlays other terminologies, do they have a formal methodology for expanding content?							
		Does the vocabulary show how representations are developed?							
		Does the vocabulary take on the burden of keeping extensions up-to-date and consistent with future releases of the underlying vocabulary?							
		Are the revisions substantial? If so, consider how reorganization or other modifications of the underlying vocabulary may impact the extension.							
Accessibility and Distribution	Consider the mechanism(s) by which the content of the vocabulary would be made available to the community and distributed over the Grid.	Is the vocabulary freely available for download in a format(s) that can be readily used by the community:	RRF						
			OWL						
			XML						
		If the vocabulary is not available in an appropriate format, is there a clear and reliable path by which the format can be transformed into one of the above?							
		Has an effective user interface been built?							
	Is there support for computer interface and system implementers?								
Intellectual Property Considerations	Is the vocabulary freely disseminated without restriction?	Is the vocabulary available to all classifications of users (e.g. government agencies, for-profit and not-for-profit institutions, academia, private citizens, etc.)?							
		Is there NO fee associated with dissemination and use?							
		Is there NO need to obtain permission from provider?							
		Are there NO restrictions based on nationality?							
		Does free dissemination without restriction also apply to extensions and modifications?							
	Is the vocabulary NOT licensed for a limited term? If it is, need to carefully consider the risks involved.								
Quality Assurance and Quality Control	Are there internal checks to detect and eliminate errors in modeling and/or editing?								
	Does the documentation describe the review and validation process used to achieve good quality?								
	Is there a process for review by independent experts from the field in which the vocabulary will be used?								
	Is there a process in which the vocabulary developer can improve the vocabulary in response to the findings and recommendations of the review?								

Textual Definitions	Does the vocabulary provide a clear textual									
	Are the definitions of terms sufficient to distinguish the meaning of that concept from other concepts in the vocabulary?	For Bronze level compatibility, definitions should:	be stated in the singular							
			describe what the concept is, not just what it is not							
			be stated as a descriptive phrase or sentence(s)							
			contain only commonly understood abbreviations that are themselves defined in the vocabulary							
			be expressed without embedding definitions of other concepts (i.e. any other concepts that are required must							
		For Silver level compatibility, definitions should:	not involve circular reasoning (i.e. they should not use the term in its definition)							
			describe the essential nature of the concepts							
			be concise, precise and unambiguous							
			be expressed without embedding rationale, functional usage or procedural							
use the same vocabulary and consistent logical structure to describe similar concepts										
	include description logic relationships to other concepts in the vocabulary									
Community Acceptance	Has a scientific community accepted the vocabulary as a de facto standard?									
	Are there NO other "community standards" in this domain? If there are, what are there?									
	Has the vocabulary been used to annotate a large body of relevant data? If so, what are some examples of such data?									
	Are there NO other terminologies with high use in the "communities" so far? If there are, what are they?									
	Are the communities in which the vocabulary will be used? If so, what are they? — e.g. research, epidemiology, clinical trials, drug development, diagnostics									
	Is there NOTHING controversial about the vocabulary that should be considered? If there is, describe.									
Reporting Requirements	Has a health regulatory body required this vocabulary for reporting? If so, which one(s)?									
	Can the regulatory body be local? -- e.g. IRB									
	If a regulatory body requires this vocabulary for reporting, what are the requirements?									
	Is the vocabulary intended to be used for reporting to a regulatory body? If so, which one(s)?									
	Does a regulatory body accept an alternate vocabulary? If so, which one(s)?									